DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 430 CS 012 838

AUTHOR Marsh, David D.

TITLE Educational Leadership for the 21st Century: Integrating Three Emerging Perspectives.

PUB DATE Mar 97

NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).

PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Effectiveness; *Administrator Role; *Educational Change; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Futures (of Society); Instructional Leadership; *Leadership; *Principals; School Based Management; Strategic Planning

ABSTRACT

Dramatic changes in the work environment of education have resulted in role ambiguity and role overload for school principals. This paper explores the role of the principal of self-managing schools, especially as the role relates to educational leadership over the next decade. Several themes in the educational reforms likely to emerge and grow across national settings over the next 10 years are explored. The next section presents three interconnected perspectives on educational leadership (the cultural/school-transformation perspective, the strategic/results-driven perspective, and the linking-management-support-to-educational-improvement perspective), and discusses how these must be fit together if leadership in self-managing schools is to survive the decade. Finally, the paper presents practical applications and principal competencies that follow from the integrated view of the new educational leadership at the school level. The last section offers speculations about what will have been important educational leadership strategies as viewed 10 years from now. In the next decade, principals will need to lead from the middle, reframe the right problems, focus on the best results and sustain the focus, develop strategic thinking and planning that nurture, restructure and reculture in a powerful synergy, link management support to work structures and organizational redesign, powerfully expand teaching and learning that is linked to the new results, and create professional capacity and learning communities that are driven by results. One figure is included. (Contains 32 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TM

ED 408 699

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: INTEGRATING THREE EMERGING PERSPECTIVES

David D. Marsh
University of Southern California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Marsh
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 028 483

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Chicago in March, 1997.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The role of the school principal has evolved dramatically over the last decade (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992; Odden, 1995; Murphy and Louis, 1994). The ideal principal in the 1980's was an instructional leader who focused on four key elements of reform. First, principals, as instructional leaders, were supposed to be responsible for defining the mission of the school and setting school goals (Murphy, 1990). The goals emphasized traditional student achievement which effective principals communicated to audiences both within and outside the school and allocated time at the school so that the vision could be attained.

Second, instructional leaders were to manage what Murphy (1990) called the education production function: coordinating the curriculum, promoting quality instruction, conducting clinical supervision and teacher evaluation/appraisal, aligning instructional materials with curriculum goals, allocating and protecting instructional time, and monitoring student progress. Third, principals were to promote an academic learning climate by establishing positive high expectations and standards for student behavior and for traditionally-defined academic achievement, maintaining high visibility, and providing incentives for teachers and students. They were also supposed to promote and manage professional development efforts that often were isolated from instructional practice.

Finally, principals were to develop a strong culture at the school that included a safe and orderly work environment, opportunities for meaningful student involvement, strong staff collaboration and cohesion, additional outside resources in support of the school goals, and stronger links between the home and the school. As it often turned out, the focus on culture was quite disconnected from the instructional process at the school. In short, the tendency during this era was to place the burden for improvement upon the principal as the individual "strong instructional leader" in the organization.

Recent studies from many countries, however, report that school principals did not actually carry out this role, and conclude that the role may no longer be appropriate for contemporary schools. In synthesizing this research, Murphy (1994) points to dramatic changes in the work environment including a turbulent policy environment, an overwhelming

scale and pace of change, and a new view of teacher involvement and expertise. The result has been role ambiguity of massive proportions for the school principal. The same summary of research on the school principal also captured the role overload for school principals. They report that the job is much more difficult than expanded, that a new repertoire of skills is needed to function effectively, and that they have significantly changed their patterns of behavior. Murphy reports that this rampant, "role overload and role ambiguity often lead to increased stress for school administrators involved in fundamental change efforts" and "led to a personal sense of loss for principals, a loss of control and a loss of professional identity" (pp.24-25).

This paper is designed to explore the role of the principal of self-managing schools, especially as the role relates to educational leadership over the next decade. The paper is organized into several sections. First, the paper explores several themes in the educational reforms likely to emerge and grow across national settings over the next ten years. Second, the paper presents three interconnected perspectives on educational leadership and how these must be fit together if leadership in self-managing schools is to survive the decade. Finally, the paper presents practical applications and principal competencies that follow from this integrated view of the new educational leadership at the school level. This last part of the paper is a view to the future: the competencies presented are my hunch as to what will have been important educational leadership strategies as viewed 10 years from now. The hunch is not a direct extension of patterns seen in schools today. In fact, my hunch conflicts in some respects with reports of current practice as summarized by Murphy (1994) and Gurr (1995) about educational leadership in transforming or self-managing schools.

Directions in Educational Reform Over the Next Decade

In the next decade, educational reform as seen across national boundaries is likely to have several common themes relevant to the role of the principal as an educational leader. First, standards for student results are increasingly going to be defined and assessed at the

system level, with dramatically improved technology for assessing important student performance (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992; Odden, 1995). At the same time, customer satisfaction will matter more as competition for students increases and choice becomes more prevalent. Customer satisfaction and school performance will become more synergistic because of societal trends common across countries, because customers care about student performance, and because the value a school adds to student performance will matter more than it has before to customers. Of course, customers will continue to care about other dimensions of school quality: parents care about a safe and supportive environment for their student, and universities and employers care what students know and are able to do after leaving the school.

Second, the shift from a rule-driven to a results-driven system where local schools have much greater authority and control of resources, within a framework worked out at the system level, will intensify. This shift will continue the expansion of leadership roles and organizational support needed within the school, create a very different culture, and value much different views of expertise and collaboration. Third, after years of inertia, teaching and learning will change in truly revolutionary ways. The push for "value-added" schooling and much higher student performance for all students will force schools to dramatically change the way teaching and learning take place. The enhanced clarity about student performance standards and the improved assessment technology will act both to prod schools and to finally provide the assessment support needed to clarify how students are doing. At the same time, new approaches to curriculum design linked to the standards, stronger efforts at finding "best" instructional practices by using bench marking in an international context, and powerful uses of technology that enhances school learning and links it to the resources of the learning society will become dominant. Yet, these new approaches to assessment, curriculum and instruction/technology will only be successful if the school restructuring and reculturing happens as implied above.

At the same time, the next decade will also be characterized by political, economic and social issues of stunning complexity and tenacity. These issues will evolve with rapid speed, but are likely to accelerate the reshaping of schools themselves as well as the world "beyond" the school. Schools are likely to have new strategic partnerships with families and community agencies characterized by new approaches to incentives and accountability, and shared but limited resources (see Tucker and Codding, in press; Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1995). All these trends have strong implications for the nature of educational leadership needed by school principals.

Rethinking the Role of the School Principal As An Educational Leader

It is clear that the old role of the principal as the solitary instructional leader is inadequate for the new directions in educational reform over the next decade. That directive and clinical view of instructional leadership no longer fits the realities of time and work load for principals. That view also blocks the development of the collective leadership, culture and expertise needed for success in the reforms, and assumes that reforms can be aligned and packaged in outdated and rigid ways. Instead, the educational leadership role of the school principal will be reinvented within three perspectives of emerging thought and practice.

Two premises underlie this new view of the educational role for school principals. First, before the end of the next decade, the educational role of school principals will be critically important to the success of their schools. While the role ambiguity and overload described by principals in schools embarking on massive change and self-management are currently dominant, successful principals will evolve the role to include setting the strategic direction for the school--a direction that requires considerable insight about education and the new interface between management support and educational reform. Pressures for accountability and value added will also push schools to improve in ways that require fundamental paradigm shifts in the nature of schooling. These paradigm shifts will involve

major change and new patterns of leadership, but also the significant educational leadership of the school principal--the reforms won t be successful without this educational leadership from the principal.

Second, the new educational role for school principals will need to be reinvented--mere extensions of previous views of the role will inform but not suffice as the basis for the new role. Moreover, all three of these perspectives on the new educational role of the school principal are needed to invent this vital new role for educational leadership in self-managing schools, and that an integration of these three perspectives creates interesting and useful basis for identifying the knowledge and competencies which will be described later in the paper.

The Cultural/School Transformation Perspective

An important view of the educational role of the school principal is that of a transformational leader (Murphy and Louis, 1994; Fullan, 1993). Sergiovanni (1991) identifies transformational leadership in terms of three leadership components: building, bonding and banking. Building entails empowerment, symbolic leadership, and charisma that leads to raised expectations of leaders and followers so that they are motivated to higher levels of commitment and performance. For Sergiovanni, bonding elevates organizational goals and purposes through a covenant that binds together leader and followers in a moral commitment. This type of leadership involves cultural leadership, moral leadership, covenant building and followership. Finally, Sergiovanni thinks of transformation as banking where improvements are turned into the routine so that they become second nature in the school. This leadership is carried out through institutional leadership, servant leadership, and leadership by outrage.

This new view of culture and learning organization draws heavily on the notion of a complex dynamic world involving both continuous change and continuous conservation (Senge, 1990). Schools as organizations are viewed as organic where values (Sergiovanni, 1991) and moral passion (Fullan, 1993) rather than objectives are the basis for the school's orientation. Relationships in this learning organization are a community of inter-connected web of

relationships in which all processes are reciprocal (Lambert, et al., 1995; Caldwell and Spinks, 1992; Odden, 1995).

In these organizations/communities, leaders work from the middle rather than the top of the organization (Kouzes and Posner, 1995; Murphy, 1994; O Toole, 1995). They work to facilitate ongoing change through problem solving (Leithwood and Steinbach, 1995), conceptual thinking (Hallinger, Leithwood and Murphy, 1993) reflection (Sergiovanni, 1991) and creating a learning community (Fullan, 1993; Senge, 1990). Leaders are effective when they create a culture where practitioners can be successful. The image is one of empowering and building capacity.

Moreover, a new form of expertise is needed for all participants. All members of the organization need skills in working together as well as expertise in inventing new arrangements for teaching and learning. Acquiring this expertise is more a matter of culture and reflection rather than of technical skills (Fullan, 1993) and includes norms of experimentation, risk taking, common technical language and collaboration (Little, 1990).

It is in this view of transformational leadership that Murphy noted the emerging role ambiguity and work overload of principals in transforming schools (Murphy, 1994). Murphy (1994) and Gurr (1995) report that principals in these schools have diminished their former role in instructional leadership.

The Strategic/Results-Driven Perspective

Leaders in restructured schools typically work in educational systems which increasingly are tightly coupled around results and loosely coupled around means for attaining these results (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992; Marsh, 1995; Odden, 1995). These desired results are typically a combination of system-defined student performance standards and locally-defined views of market niche and customer satisfaction. Successful schools are finding that the two views of results are mutually enhancing rather than contradictory, as first imagined. Arriving at this understanding is a hallmark of successful educational leadership.

In some national settings, the system is already targeted toward high student performance, even as it continues to evolve in dynamic ways. In the somewhat unique case of the United States, however, the system focus on high student performance standards and high stakes assessment that matters both to the school and the student is still being developed. Many issues still abound: should the standards be defined at the local school or system level, should they be the same for all students, and should they have high stakes consequences for the school and/or the student? Many states are moving toward a view of statewide standards common for all students in at least some academic subjects, and with some pressure/accountability for the school, and perhaps the student. Conversely, Marsh (1996) reports that individual schools working in isolation are having more difficulty in consolidating a clear view of desired results. Tucker (1994a, 1994b, 1994c) has proposed, and many states are considering adopting, a new high school diploma which is based on performance not course completion, engages students to work hard to meet the standards, and has strong incentives for high performance both for the school and the student. This new diploma is similar to that found in most other western countries.

Assuming that this result orientation is established--the combination of system-defined student performance indicators/accountability and local customer satisfaction/niche--schools will need two types of strategic leadership that are not found in the transformational leadership: a) leadership focused on results-indicators/ accountability within the tightly-coupled educational and social system, and b) substantive leadership for reshaping the school as an organization to help all students meet the high performance standards while also achieving quality/market goals.

The reshaping of the school will involve planning backward from intended results in a dynamic and powerful way that builds on the strengths of the school as a learning organization rather than on the installation of proven new programs (Odden, 1995). Drawing on the work of Mohrman and Wohlstetter (1994), Odden (1995) portrays this reshaping as including four interrelated segments:

- o Recognizing the need for fundamental change
- o Forming an organizational strategy to respond
- o Redesigning the work and structure of the organization--the vision of teaching and learning, and
- o Implementing the design, assessing impacts, and refining and changing overtime

These strategies for fundamental redesign of the organization have special importance for leadership in restructured schools.

For restructured schools, mobilizing understanding of the need for change and developing the commitment to engage in fundamental reform will have a special quality. Odden (1995) reports that in the private sector, "pressures to engage in fundamental change derive from the environment and international competition. Corporations and work teams work within them either understanding that in order to stay in business, they must deliver services or make products that are better or lower priced, or they quickly lose market share and are forced out of business." (p. 293.) In contrast, pressure in education for reform is likely to be a combination of system-defined results indicators coupled with a local commitment and understanding supported by moral passion to change the schools to high performing organizations (Odden, 1995). Forming an organizational strategy to respond will require new approaches to the change process and reform. Odden summarizes numerous authors in reporting that fast-paced large scale change will require a more decentralized, team-driven organizational response.

It is the redesigning of work and structure of the organization that requires the new educational leadership paradigm. This task involves building a fundamentally fresh understanding of the student learning and performance problems, and developing powerful new ways of seeing how schools might be organized and conducted to resolve those problems. Mohrman (1994) suggests this means "a willingness to challenge professional practices and create new ones with confusion and stress." Odden (1995) reports that after developing a shared understanding of the problem, school-based teams then need to construct a common

vision of teaching and learning and school organization. This vision needs to focus on results and on linking dramatically improved teaching and learning to those results. Redesigning the work and structure of the organization will include a delicate balancing of examining effective programs while recognizing how those programs must be dramatically reworked to meet the needs of the local setting. In Odden's terms, "The vision created should viewed as tentative, as something with high potential that will be tried, but more likely will need to be redesigned and modified more than once over time (p.297).

Finally, Mohrman proposes the need for implementing the design, assessing impact, refining and redesigning over time. Characteristics of this new change process include: a) a learning organization focused on resolving problems and on needed high performance results, and b) substantial ongoing training and professional development. These characteristics are discussed in more detail later in this paper.

Linking Management Support to Educational Improvement Perspective

The third perspective required in the new approach to educational leadership is the linkage of management support to the new educational improvement. Traditional management functions such as personnel and budgeting will have to be redesigned in dramatic new ways if these functions meaningfully support the new educational reform effort. Characteristics of the new support system include:

1. Definition and design of the purposes of management function in terms of the strategic direction adopted. For example, the problem with information systems is not simply to decentralize information to the local school but also to rethink what information is needed--an educational leadership issue. For example, assessments of student work are important new types of information that are not easily quantified and stored on a computer.

2. The system has to be usable by support staff and high performance work teams. The system must be user-friendly in terms of imputing, storing, retrieving and utilizing information. This includes:

   o Access-- Redesign how the management functions are carried out so that large numbers of staff have appropriate access to designing and operating the management function and the function itself is user-friendly. For example, the budgeting system of the management information system at the school level are easily used for a variety of purposes that support high performance work teams.

   o Educational program focused-- Redesign all management functions so that they better serve the high performance work teams and the dynamic ongoing change processes in the organization in order to achieve high student results. Management functions must be much more tightly aligned with student results if they are to adequately serve the leadership in self-managing schools.

   o Synergism of support services-- Reconnect various management functions so that, for example, management information, budgeting and personnel work synergistically both to increase their impact and to increase their operational efficiency.

3. The system must be highly efficient, use technology in powerful ways, provide fast response and flexibility in displaying information. It must also provide strong assistance to users, including:

   o Changing the culture and technical support provided by the system so that schools can be effective in carrying these management functions.

   o Changing the culture and technical support at the school to enhance the efficiency of the system and allow multiple participants in the system as opposed to having only the principal be involved at the school level.

4. Especially in self managing schools, information must be accessible by external audiences ranging from community members to policy makers and monitors, in appropriate fashions.

Overall, the management functions have to support the central mission of the educational program in a much more direct fashion. The critical educational issue will be the interface of the support services with educational improvement efforts--the strategic issue is understanding this interface and helping collective leaders at the schools use the system effectively.

Marsh (1992) studied the connection of management support to educational leadership, and found that school principals progressed through three stages in their ability to make these connections. The 3 stages in the development of strong educational leaders able to link management support services with educational improvement are portrayed in Figure 1.

Educational leaders at Stage 1 focus primarily on the "nuts and bolts" of school management. They learn to operate these management functions at the school level as discreet pieces--the master schedule is not linked to the personnel and teacher evaluation system, for example. In addition, Stage 1 educational leaders have no focus on educational leadership.

Stage 2 leaders are typical of school principals across many national settings. Here, they have greater capacity for carrying out management functions. They are also good at carrying out the pieces of educational leadership and reflecting about management functions or these educational leadership pieces. They have a fragmented view of educational leadership, but they are quite good at carrying out pieces of work in the education setting.

Stage 3 leaders are different from Stage 2 not so much by their overt actions, but rather by their understanding of the whole. This whole includes the integration of management functions and educational leadership, that is, they see how functions such as budgeting and personnel can be linked to the teaching and learning and high performance work teams, for example. Moreover, they are quite insightful about the integration of various educational leadership pieces and are reflective about the integration of educational leadership and school

life, especially towards student results. It is only Stage 3 leaders who are able to manage the interface between management functions and the educational program both in terms of designing these support services for high performing work teams and operating these management functions, even if the operational details are ultimately delegated to other participants of at the school.

Practical Applications and Competencies: A view From the Future

The view of educational leadership described above has a number of implications for the practical application and the knowledge and skills that principals will need over the next decade. This last part of the paper is a view to the future: the competencies presented are my hunch as to what will have been important educational leadership strategies as viewed 10 years from now, and so I have written them in the past tense as viewed from that future point. These hunches are not a direct extension of patterns seen in schools today. In fact, my hunch conflicts in some respects with reports of current practice as summarized by Murphy (1994) and Gurr (1995) about educational leadership in transforming or self-managing schools, as discussed above. These hunches, however, do fit very well with Caldwell's (1996) evolving stages of leadership needed for schools of the future. The competencies and strategies for principals that follow are written as lesson learned as viewed a decade from now: lessons from the 21st century for leadership in schools.

Leading from the Middle Still Required a Substantive Leader

Principals in successful schools combined both personal and positional educational leadership in their schools. At a personal level, they developed over time a very deep understanding of teaching and learning and the way that relates to the new student outcomes. This learning was credible to teachers and parents and built on a moral base linked to student results. Successful principals were able to persuade others through mentoring, coaching, and

School Principals As Educational Leaders: Developmental Stages

STAGE 1: GETTING STARTED

Initial socialization into the role of site administrator

Development of routine management skills

No real focus on educational leadership

Reflection about the nuts and bolts of school management and own role in the school

STAGE 2: DOING THE PIECES OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Enhancement of management capability

Mastery of pieces of educational responsibilities

Fragmented views of educational leadership

Reflection about management and educational leadership pieces

School change is incremental and fragmented

STAGE 3: UNDERSTANDING THE WHOLE OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Integration of management and educational leadership

Integration of educational leadership pieces (activities and functions)

Deepening and integration of views of educational leadership

Reflection about integrated educational leadership and school life

Transformation of the school in relation to the vision; the school is substantially changed

Figure 1

planning, but in the end, their influence was both substantive educationally as well as collaborative and transforming.

At the same time, successful principals used their positional power to structure the school so that deep problems, important results and school restructuring hinged on a powerful view of student results. In their positional role, these leaders sorted out governance structures from management and implementation structures, even as these evolved continuously. They helped governance groups focus on student results and monitor these results, while the groups stayed out of micro managing the school (see Marsh, 1995; Tucker and Codding, 1995). Conversely, the principals established a set of cross-role groups that provided a variety of implementation and management structures, as will be discussed below. Finally, these successful principals created structures where many leaders emerged at the school--all with an important educational focus which successful principals built into the structure, culture, and results focus.

Reframe the Right Problems

Fullan (1993) finds that successful and fundamental change efforts entail a love of problems. Other researchers have found that schools that avoided or denied problems were typically schools with poor student performance relative to the capacity of that school. In turn, successful schools embraced problems and believed it took a long time and hard work to create meaningful resolution of those problems. Successful leaders in self-managing schools had more guidance from the system about critical student outcomes, which would account for success at the school. Successful principals helped the school internalize the importance of those system results and understand them in educational as well as political terms. At the same time, these principals were excellent at reframing problems within the school to identify the most powerful means to help students reach those systemically-defined student results. Successful principals also married the concept of market niche, customer satisfaction and student results through reframing problems so that all three became interrelated and mutually supporting priorities.

One way successful principals reframed the problems is through the use of the four lenses proposed by Deal and Kennedy (1982). In reframing the problems, the lenses helped illuminate different dimensions of the problem itself as well as the desired resolution. Successful principals had a "nose" for the right problems. Schools faced many problems and often were almost paralyzed by the overwhelming number and interconnectedness of the problems. Unsuccessful school leaders attempted to solve these problems one at a time. Successful school principals reframed patterns of problems into fewer large problems focused directly on student results and the means to help students achieve them.

Focus on the Best Results and Sustain the Focus

Successful principals thought about results and quality of the school in several ways. They were able to combine system defined student performance results with local indicators of student growth and customer satisfaction. This connection was both political and educationally powerful, grew out of the collective view of important education at the school as stimulated by the principal, and served to focus strategic and operational efforts at the school. Successful principals were able to understand and articulate the deep meaning of these results while explaining them in concrete terms to various audiences.

Successful principals also thought in terms of "value added" and improvement targets for their student results and quality indicators. Consequently, the school was frequently focused on performance for all students, in the context of students at other schools as well as the relative improvement these students had made, and the role the school had played in accomplishing that. Successful principals helped the school use these indicators of success as anchors for decisions, program priorities and support services. Since the world was increasingly dynamic and fast-changing, successful principals were able to anticipate changes in societal directions and anticipate the consequences for the indicators.

At the same time, the school had a vision of teaching and learning that mattered--the vision represented the "best bets" as to what schooling conditions would help students achieve the desired student results. Stated differently, the key indicators at the school operated at two

levels--the learning environment indicators as part of the vision, and the result indicators which this vision was designed to achieve. On the one hand, the vision was robust in incorporating many dimensions of teaching and learning while the other hand remained flexible and continually rethought in relation to the results. Moreover, the vision itself had indicators of success and became more than a vague picture of the desired school. Faculty, staff, community and others could map the relative success the school in accomplishing its vision both in terms of the vision being implemented and the vision being powerfully related to student results. In short, the school had clear results indicators with improvement targets and a view of value added for all students. Linked to this was a powerful and integrated school vision which had indicators of implementation and ongoing flexible mechanisms for connecting vision to results. The connections represent the best of reflection, of learning community and cultural and transformation view of leadership.

Developed Strategic Thinking/Planning that Mattered

Successful principals developed strategic and system thinking in a way that was infectious across the organization. They engaged cross-role work teams in creating strategic plans for their own team as well as school-wide plans, all driven by result indicators. The plans linked the organizational and governance changes in the school to the instructional improvement and ultimately student results, customer satisfaction and quality indicators, and represented a compact between various constituencies responsible for the school. The plans embodied long-term strategic planning linked to action planning on a yearly basis as proposed by Caldwell and Spinks (1992) and Holmes and Davies (1994). The planning/thinking also linked management resources to the substance of the schools, and had revision cycles that mattered in terms of resource allocation, program assessment and accountability. Finally, the plans were short, results-focused, easily understood by all the groups and publicly acknowledged and displayed.

Successful principals needed many skills and competencies to make the strategic thinking/planning effective. They needed a deep understanding of the results of the school and

the possible effects of various alternative strategic directions. They needed process skills in engaging others in this thinking and ways to portray and reframe problems within the strategic thinking/planning period. They needed to engage others in taking seriously the planning/thinking process as the basis for access to resources and accomplishment of their workgroups. Finally, principals needed to help identify results while clearly staying out of micromanaging the process to achieve those results.

Restructured and Recultured in a Powerful Synergy

Successful principals worked in ways similar to Mohrman's (1994) view that schools must be restructured and recultured into high performance work teams before the actual changes in teaching and learning are carried out. Establishing these meaningful works structures distinguished successful principals over the decade--other principals tried to reculture without restructuring at the same time, and achieved little in the end. Aside from the personal dimensions of establishing work groups, principals needed to align responsibility, authority and accountability so that individuals are designated groups who are responsible for efforts also have the authority and accountability for their accomplishment. Successful principals helped establish these workgroups not by management functions, but rather by integrating the various dimensions of an effective learning environment so that a group of students could be successful. Principals need to help define the appropriate size of workgroups, including establishing small school units where personal connection and communication could be maximized. Successful principals also helped realigned incentives and support structures for these workgroups.

Linked Management Support to Work Structures and Organizational Redesign

As described above, Marsh (1992) found that Stage 3 educational leaders had a holistic understanding of the interface of management supports to the educational efforts of the school as linked to strong student results and institutional success. These leaders were distinguished by their ability to understand the connections--an understanding composed of educational connections, political savvy and organizational dynamics. What made these principals strong

educational leaders was their ability to structure support services connected to important work structures that helped students learn. These connections entailed, in part, redirecting traditional functions such as fiscal and personnel so that work teams had greater control of the decisions in these support areas. Moreover, successful principals helped design and transform the way these support services are carried out though greatly enhanced technology and efficiency, a wider set of meaningful users of the support services, and easier access to the support services in user-friendly modalities. For example, successful schools were able to establish new and dramatically better information support services that decentralized information from the district office and made it much more accessible and useful within the school. These new management information systems also included new kinds of information found in student learning portfolios that greatly enhanced instruction that helped students learn effectively.

Additionally, successful principals were able to increase the management support services and fiscal resources available in service of the critically important educational program. They carefully distinguished cash cows from vitally important educational services (see Davies and Ellison, 1994). They also developed strong management support staff closely integrated with the high performance work teams so that the principal as an individual was not operating the management support services. The principal did, however, manage the linkage of the management support services to the high performance work teams in ways that greatly enhanced and empowered team performance.

Powerfully Expanded Teaching and Learning Linked to the New Results

Successful principals knew the attributes of good teaching/learning and the pragmatics of what teaching and learning ought look like in various subjects and for various grade levels. The value of this understanding was not to have the principal serve as expert who demanded or monitored improvement for individual teachers. Instead, this understanding led to collaboration with team leaders of high performance work teams able to carry out powerful instruction and instructional improvement efforts--the principal's role was more strategic than

clinical and very different from the previous instructional leadership paradigm. Successful principals also focused teaching and learning on the success for all students through moral persuasion, use of data, structuring work teams to accommodate varieties of students and a culture that promoted student success, whatever it took.

Successful principals also had networks and a strong understanding of emerging but promising learning approaches that would greatly enhance the power of teaching and learning at the school. They helped the school benchmark its most successful practices across the whole world. For example, many schools recently have benefited extensively from the thinking about teaching and learning found in China and Japan (see Stevenson and Stigler, 1995). This provocative and helpful view of curriculum design, teacher collaboration and careful instructional practice has deeply influenced teachers in many other countries. As Odden (1995) reports, principals are going to need to view "effective programs" in several ways: as the best available insight about powerful teaching and learning while also as only an approximation of what might ultimately be the most effective learning environments linked to the school's own particular students and results. Moreover, successful principals worked to plan backwards from desired student learning and therefore, provide tools for targeting and teaching learning on these results. Principals helped work teams establish and carry out improvement strategies such as evaluation, aligning instructional materials with curriculum, and managing information about student and program performance.

Successful principals also created new partnerships for teaching and learning--a strategic approach to engaging students and the community more powerfully as direct support for strong student performance. At best, the student and the school's learning environment are in a delicate "dance of learning" where both partners must work together in a complex and unique way. Schools that intended to improve teaching and learning only through the improvement of high performance work teams and instructional strategies missed the opportunity to get the equal participation from students. Successful principals understood the need for student motivation and hard work and the community organization and family

supports that helped students be engaged in this way. Consequently, successful principals transformed partnerships with community agencies from bureaucratic connections to support services for powerful student learning. At the same time, they widened the available school resources to beyond the school setting and the school day. These new partnerships require more than communication; they required focus on student learning and the interrelated set of strategies and supports that helped students do well.

Created Professional Capacity and Learning Communities Driven by Results

Successful principals worked hard to help colleagues build professional capacity and effective learning communities at the school. The stronger capacity was needed by the high performance work teams in the form of expertise and inventiveness that helped them do their work. Principals helped with building networks and multiple collaboration arrangements that supported teacher connection outside and within the school. Capacity building of several forms was promoted: training that included modeling, practice and feedback; collaboration and planning; inquiry and problem-solving. The capacity building also used the criteria proposed by Little (1993) for good professional development: a) meaningful intellectual, social and emotional development with ideas and materials, b) explicit accounting of the context of teaching and the experience of teachers, c) support for informed dissent, d) classroom practice in the larger contexts of school practice and purposes, e) supported techniques and perspectives of inquiry, and f) governance that featured bureaucratic constraint and balanced individual and institutional interests.

What will make this leadership distinctive for leaders in self-managed schools are several features. First, these leaders will have linked the professional development and learning community work to the student performance and other results in a powerful and accountable way. Second, these schools will have created high performance work teams so that the organizational/change process context will be especially rich for the capacity and learning communities. Finally , these principals will have redesigned the management support functions to support professional development and learning, and will have redirected resources

controlled by the high performance work teams to invest heavily in professional development, and incentives for high performance (Odden, 1995). Bold redirection of resources and very strong learning communities driven by results were among the most distinctive strategies of successful school principals.

Conclusion: A New View of Educational Leadership

In conclusion, my hunch is that from the perspective of hindsight as viewed from a decade in the future; successful principals will have invented a new form of educational leadership. These leaders will have joined the transformational power of collaboration and leading from the middle to the high performance work teams where a new form of expertise and learning community driven by results are dominant. With the new interface of management support for the educational efforts at these schools, these principals will have had a strategic influence on internalizing the results, and planning backwards to redesign the school to help all students meet high performance expectations. These schools will be able to dramatically improve teaching and learning, not because the principal set others to do the work; but instead, because the principal had a new form of educational leadership that provided substantive and cultural leadership to the transformation of the school linked to the high performance organizational arrangements that support the results-driven collective focus.

References

Caldwell, B. J. (1996, September). Beyond the self-managing school. A paper presented as the Keynote Address at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Management and Administration Society in Coventry, England.

Caldwell, B. J. and Spinks, J. (1992). Leading the self-managing school. London: Falmer.

Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1995). Great transitions: Preparing adolescents for a new century.

Davies, B. and Ellison, L. (Eds.) (1994). Managing the effective primary school. London: Longman.

Deal, T. and Kennedy, A. A. (1982). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Fullan, M. (1993). Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform. London: Falmer.

Gurr, D. (1995). The leadership role of principals in selected "Secondary Schools of the Future": Principal and teacher perspectives. Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia.

Hallinger, P., Leithwood, K. and Murphy, J. (Eds.) (1993). Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership. New York: Teachers College Press.

Holmes, G. and Davies, B. (1994). Strategic management in primary schools. In B. Davies and L. Ellison (Eds.) (1994). Managing the effective primary school. London: Longman.

Kouzes, J. and Posner, B. (1995). The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lambert, L., Walker, D., Zimmerman, D., Cooper, J., Lambert, M. D., Gardner, M. and Slack, P. J. (1995). The constructivist leader. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lawler, E. E. (1992). The ultimate advantage: Creating the high involvement organization. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Leithwood, K. and Steinbach, R. (1995). Expert problem solving: Evidence from school and district leaders. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Little, J. W. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 5 (2), 129-151.

Marsh, D. D. (1992). Enhancing instructional leadership: Lessons from the California school leadership academy. Education and Urban Society, 24 (3), 386-409.

Marsh, D. D. (1995). Restructuring for results: High performance management in the Edmonton public schools. Washington, D.C.: The National Center on Education and the Economy.

Marsh, D. D. (1996). Making school reform work: Lessons from successful schools. Thrust for educational leadership.

Mohrman, S. (1994). Making the transition to high-performance management. In S. Mohrman, P. Wohlstetter, and Associates (1994). School-based management: Organizing for high performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mohrman, S., Wohlstetter, P. and Associates (1994). School-based management: Organizing for high performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. Advances in Educational Administration: Changing Perspectives on the School, 1 163-200.

Murphy, J. (1994). Transformational change and the evolving role of the principal: Early empirical evidence. In J. Murphy and K. S. Louis (Eds.) Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts. Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. and Louis, K. S. (Eds.) (1994). Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Corwin Press.

Odden, A. R. (1995). Educational leadership for America's schools. New York: McGraw-Hill

O'Toole, J. (1995). Leading change: Overcoming the ideology of comfort and the tyranny of custom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. London: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). Value-added leadership. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Stevenson, H and Stigler, J. (1994). The learning gap: Why our schools are failing and what we can learn from Japanese and Chinese education. New York: Touchstone.

Tucker, M. (1994a). States begin developing the Certificate of Initial Mastery. Washington, D.C.: The National Center on Education and the Economy.

Tucker, M. (1994b). The Certificate of Initial Mastery: A primer. Washington, D.C.: The National Center on Education and the Economy.

Tucker, M. (1994c). The international experience with school leaving examinations. Washington, D.C.: The National Center on Education and the Economy.

Tucker, M. and Codding, J. (1995). Organizing alliance schools for results. Washington, D.C.: National Center on Education and the Economy.

Tucker, M. and Codding, J. (in press). Getting results. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.